

PSC Discussion Papers Series

Volume 12 | Issue 1

Article 1

4-1998

Time Availability and Relative Resources as Determinants of the Sexual Division of Domestic Work

Seth McFarlane

University of Western Ontario

Roderic Beaujot

University of Western Ontario, rbeaujot@uwo.ca

Tony Haddad

University of Western Ontario

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/pscpapers>

Recommended Citation

McFarlane, Seth; Beaujot, Roderic; and Haddad, Tony (1998) "Time Availability and Relative Resources as Determinants of the Sexual Division of Domestic Work," *PSC Discussion Papers Series*: Vol. 12 : Iss. 1 , Article 1.

Available at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/pscpapers/vol12/iss1/1>

ISSN 1183-7284
ISBN 0-7714-2096-X

**Time Availability and Relative Resources
as Determinants of the Sexual Division
of Domestic Work**

by
Seth McFarlane
Roderic Beaujot
and
Tony Haddad

Discussion Paper no. 98-1

April 1998

beaujot@sscl.uwo.ca

Time Availability and Relative Resources as Determinants of the Sexual Division of Domestic Work

Abstract

Based on data from the 1992 Canadian General Social Survey on time-use, the time spent in housework and in child care are analyzed for women and men who are working full-time in dual-earner families. It is found that living with children under 19 years of age increases the average time spent in housework and child care and reduces that in paid work for both men and women. Time availability considerations, associated with the time demands of the family and the capacity to respond given the time in paid work, are found to be important determinants, especially for time spent in child care. However, there were also important elements of gender asymmetry in the results, pointing to the importance of relative resources and gender itself as relevant considerations. In particular, women's time in housework is increased when their husbands spend more time in paid work, but men are not affected by the employment time of their wives. In addition, women do less housework when they earn more than half of family income.

The movement of married women into paid work and the consequent rise of the dual-earner family as the modal family form in Canada has had a significant impact on the division of household labour between couples. However, it is generally agreed that this change has affected women more than men, and that women bear the brunt of the "time crunch" arising out of the family-work interface (Hochschild 1989; Kempeneers, 1992).

The search for explanations of the distribution of household labour can usefully be divided between economic and cultural considerations (Brines, 1994), or between "pragmatic strategies" and "patriarchal dynamics" (Haddad, 1996). The economic perspective pays particular attention to available time, and to the relative amount of income and other resources that spouses may exchange for unpaid work. On the other hand, the cultural perspective considers housework as a form of doing gender. That is, the "patriarchal dynamics" approach holds that there is something about the social construction of gender itself that maintains an inequality in unpaid work.

The **pragmatic strategy** approach is based on liberal-functionalist conceptions of the relationship between the individual and society. Parsons and Bales (1955) argue that a role differentiation based on male specialization in instrumental activities and female specialization in expressive activities permitted a functional allocation of tasks within families. Similarly, Blood and Wolfe (1960) theorize that the sexual division of domestic labour is a function of spouses' relative contributions of resources to the household. The person with more resources would do less domestic work. Becker (1965, 1981) bases his understanding of families on the efficiency that is obtained by spousal specialization in income generation and unpaid work respectively. In effect, these conceptions are based on the view that the key issue is not gender, but rather a pragmatic allocation of tasks. As Haddad (1996) indicates, it is based on the view that it is individual abilities that count, rather than unequal access to social and economic opportunities within external structures, for women and men.

The **patriarchal dynamics** approach challenges the notion that sexual inequality is founded on individual differences in abilities. Engels (1975) argues that the separation of

domestic and economic spheres in the context of the historical development of class society led to the economic disempowerment of women and the evolution of the family as the primary site of women's subordination and exploitation. Delphy and Leonard (1992) interpret domestic work in terms of husbands exploiting the products of wives' labour. Similarly, Hartmann (1981: 372) proposes that the family is the primary arena where men exert their patriarchal power over women's labour. In this framework, women's greater involvement in domestic labour is a key element in sexual inequality (Haddad, 1996: 89). It is around household work that gender relations are produced and reproduced on a daily basis (Berk, 1985).

These broad theoretical views can be further specified in terms of more immediate factors. The economic or practical perspective pays particular attention to relative resources and time availability. Given available data, these are the determinants that are analyzed in the present study. After a further elaboration of the theoretical context, the purpose of this study is to assess the relative importance of hypotheses associated with relative resources (income and relative income) and time availability (time in paid work and time demands associated with family structure). Besides testing these hypotheses on a nationally representative sample, this study is unique in several regards. First it is based on time-use diaries that capture all activities over a 24 hour period and permit an inclusive definition of household activities. Second, parallel analyses are carried out for men and women in order to assess the extent of symmetry in determinants, rather than focus only on the extent of men's participation in household work. Finally, by selecting a sample of persons who are in dual-earner families where both spouses work full-time, the presence or absence of symmetry in the results can be interpreted in terms of a gender perspective on

unpaid work.

Relative Resources

The basic idea of the relative resources perspective is that households seek efficiency by allocating their resources to achieve the greatest possible well-being. In terms of unpaid work, the person who brings more resources into the relationship can exchange this for doing less onerous work. Relative resources may be seen as a measure of the differential power of spouses, and negotiations regarding domestic work would be based on this relative power. Based on Blood and Wolfe (1960), Kamo (1988: 180) suggests that "a spouse will do domestic work to the extent that his or her relative power in the marriage is low." With men typically more involved in paid work, they bring resources to exchange for a lower participation in undesirable domestic work.

Based on a study undertaken in the United States, Spain and Bianchi (1996b: 169) observe that husbands perform a greater share of housework and child care tasks in families where wives work outside of the home, and the higher the wife's contribution to the family's income, the more equitable the division of labour in the home. Berk (1985) found that the wife's contribution to domestic work is influenced both by her employment income and the husband's income. Similarly, Kamo (1988) found that the husband's share of domestic work was negatively related to his earnings and positively related to his wife's earnings. In addition, power was the strongest variable in the analysis, with persons having more power doing less domestic work. Presser (1994) found that the wife's earnings relative to husband's earnings was a particularly important variable in increasing the husband's share in

household tasks. In his investigation of the sexual division of household work among couples living in Alberta, Harrell (1985) found that the greater the wife's income relative to the husband's, the greater his involvement in cooking and cleaning. Relative income and personal resources were also found to be significant factors associated with the amount of housework of women and men in a national Canadian sample (Nakhaie, 1995).

Part of the difficulty of the resource model is the absence of considerations for the normative and institutional constraints on a person's behaviour. This may be why some tests based on Canadian data have found little support (Haddad, 1996). Using 1986 time use data, little predictive value was attributed to relative income, that is, a person's income relative to total family income. In addition, education and income were positively related to men's participation in domestic work, contrary to the predictions of the resource model. The differential applicability of the exchange model to women and men leads Brines (1994) to question the gender neutral assumptions on which it is based. Empirical evidence demonstrates that this conceptual framework applies more to women who tend to do more domestic work when they are economically dependent. In contrast, men may even seek to avoid housework if they are economically dependent. Avoiding housework would be a form of doing gender, and it may be particularly relevant to men who do not have access to other forms of status (Haddad, 1996).

Time availability

Time availability includes both the extent to which people are available to do domestic work, given their paid work, and the family demands on their time, given in particular the

number and ages of children. In effect, it considers questions of immediate practicality in terms of doing unpaid work. Pressland and Antill (1987) find that wives reduce their time expenditure in domestic work when they do more paid work, be it part-time or full-time. On the other hand, they find that husbands adjust their time in domestic work only when their wives work full-time. Kamo (1988) finds that the husband's share in domestic work was reduced if he worked full-time and increased if he worked part-time, in addition, it was increased if his wife worked full-time and reduced if she worked part-time. Presser (1994) finds that more children increases the hours of domestic work for both spouses but also reduces the husband's share of household tasks.

Based on a 1981 Canadian time-use survey, Douthitt (1989) finds that when wives are employed the husbands with no children did 9.2 hours of weekly domestic work, compared to an average of 19.2 hours when there were children under five in the family. Among couples with children under five, husbands did 19.2 hours of domestic work when the wife was employed compared to 17.3 when she was not employed. While these variations for men were in the expected directions, women's domestic work was clearly higher and there were stronger variations by presence and ages of children as well as by their own work status. In another study based on Canadian data collected in 1982-83, Nakhaie (1995) finds that paid hours of work are particularly important in explaining gender differences in unpaid work. In effect, the author observes that, in the total sample "females do more housework because gender stands as a proxy of a relatively fewer paid hours of work by women compared to men" (idem, p. 419). Based on the same Canadian survey of Class Structure and Class Consciousness, Davies and Carrier (1995) also finds that women who do more hours of paid work perform less domestic work but not less child care. In addition, men's paid work was

found to influence women's housework, more so than women's paid work influenced men's housework.

In the analysis based on the 1986 Canadian time-use data, both men and women did less housework if they did more paid work (Haddad, 1996). Also, as would be expected, the presence of young children increased the amount of housework and child care by both sexes. However, the latter generalization was found to apply more to women than to men.

Based on American data from the early 1980s, Goldscheider and Waite (1991: 189) found that wives who are not employed do 75 percent of domestic work, while those doing 50 hours of paid work in a week did 56 percent of the family's domestic work. Employment alone is not found to make much difference for women's domestic work, but full-time employment in better paying jobs, as well as career commitment, do make a difference.

Employment schedules have been found to be significant determinants of men's domestic work in dual-earner families (Presser, 1994). In particular, men who are at home without their spouses, especially during the day, tend to do more domestic work. Coverman (1985) also found that variables relating to time availability were the most powerful predictors of husbands' time expenditure in domestic work.

Similarly, Blair and Lichter (1991) find that female employment is positively related to men's absolute and proportionate contributions to housework. These authors interpret the employment of wives as a measure of spousal power. That is, matters of relative resources and time availability make the same prediction: that more paid work on the part of wives increases their resources in negotiating domestic work, and reduces the time they have to do housework and child care. These authors analyze especially the segregation of household

tasks. While tasks are highly segregated, this differentiation is reduced when men are working less than 20 hours or women are working more than 40 hours. Davies and McAlpine (1996) find that the amount of domestic work done by spouses is most similar when the man is not employed, that is when he has more time. Nonetheless, this Canadian sample finds that women who are not employed do three-quarters of the domestic work, while men who are not employed do less than half of the family's work.

Data, methods and unadjusted differences by sex

Data are taken from the 1992 General Social Survey by Statistics Canada, which focused on time use. The sample consists of 9,815 persons aged 15 and over, or 77 percent of those targeted by this telephone survey. The time diary involved an accounting of the main activity over a 24 hour day preceding the interview. The interviews were conducted over all 12 months of 1992 and over all days of the week. The activities of respondents were coded into 167 categories.

In this study, the sample is reduced to 1,596 persons who were married or cohabiting and living with their partner, with both persons working full-time (30 or more hours per week). That is, the sample consists of persons working-full time who are in dual-earner relationships.

The multivariate analysis involves ordinary least squares. Tests indicated that the assumptions of the model were not violated; in particular there were no multi-collinearity problems. The unstandardized coefficients can be interpreted in terms of the amount of minutes of time in housework and child care that are associated with a given category of the predictor.

---Table 1 about here---

Two dependent variables are used in separate analyses that consider the time spent in housework and child care respectively. Time spent in housework is an inclusive measure involving activities from meal preparation to maintenance and shopping, along with associated travel time. Child care involves all activities associated with caring for children, as long as they were the main activity, from baby care to play with children and transportation of children. As can be seen at the bottom of Table 1, on average men spent 2.5 hours and women 3.7 hours on the total domestic work of housework and child care. On an average day, the time spent in paid work, including travelling associated with work, was 6.6 hours for men and 5.8 hours for women. Thus the "total productive work" both paid and unpaid involves an average of 9.1 hours for men and 9.5 for women. This difference of 0.4 hours per day amounts to 2.6 hours per week or 200 hours over the year. While this is a significant difference, it is considerably less than the month of 24 hour days (720 hours) that Hochschild (1989) used as a basis for the concept of The Second Shift.

That is, while this sample is restricted to persons working full-time, defined as 30 or more hours per week, the paid work time of men and women differs, and partly compensates for the difference in unpaid work time. However, women's total work time remains significantly larger than that of men. In the case of parents with children under 19 in the home, the paid work time of both men and women is reduced, but that of women undergoes a slightly stronger reduction. Conversely, as one would expect, the unpaid work time increases for both men and women, but this increase is larger for women. Consequently, the average difference is larger for parents, at 0.6 hours more total work time per day for women.

The other measures in Table 1 deserve some mention. The spouse's time devoted to paid labour was not obtained from a time-use diary because only one respondent per household was chosen. The respondent simply answered the following question: "How many hours did your spouse devote to paid labour last week?" The results show the same differences by sex as the respondent's paid work. For instance, 58.9 percent of husbands but 81.9 percent of wives had worked under 40 hours. Similarly, 43.6 percent of women respondents but 58.0 percent of men respondents had worked eight or more hours on the day under investigation.

Men and women respondents are very similar in terms of number and ages of children. The age distributions are also similar, but the women are slightly younger on average. Except in the case of professional or graduate degrees, the average education of women is slightly higher than that of men. The differences are larger for the income measures. The proportions with personal income over \$40,000 amount to 27.4 percent of women and 51.2 percent of men. The relative income measure was constructed on the bases of personal and family income, each of which had been coded into increments of \$5,000 to \$10,000. It can be seen that 25.7 percent of women but 68.4 percent of men earned more than half of the family income. A random sample would normally produce a similar measure of "earns half of family income" for men and women. Possibly because of the categories used, 27.1 percent of women but only 13.6 percent of men are in this category of relative equality. It would appear that both sexes are exaggerating their relative contribution to family income.

Determinants of time spent in domestic work

According to hypotheses related to time-availability, the time spent in domestic work would be associated with the respondent's and their partner's time in paid work, along with the number and ages of children. Both women and men in these dual earner families do less housework if they have spent more time in paid work (Table 2). However, in other regards, time availability considerations affect women more than men. In particular, the women do more housework if their partner has done more paid work, but the men are not affected by their spouse's hours in paid work. Compared to cases where there are no children under 19 in the home, women do more housework when there are children, especially when children are over 12 years of age. However, men's housework is not consistently affected by the ages and number of children. In some cases, men do less housework when there are children, especially when there is one child under five years of age.

---Table 2 about here---

Hypotheses concerning relative resources would suggest that persons with more resources would do less housework. However, the personal income and the respondent's share of household income are generally not found to be significant predictors. There is an important exception: women who earn more than half of family income do less housework.

Turning to the time spent in child care, for persons with children under 19 living at home, the measures of the number and ages of children have a comparable effect on women and men (Table 3). In comparison to the category of "two or more children under five," other categories of age and numbers of children involve less time in child care, as the time availability hypotheses would suggest. Both male and female respondents also spend

less time doing child care when they spend more time in paid work. The measures of relative resources do not significantly affect the time spent in child care. However, it should be noted that men with more education spend more time in child care.

---Table 3 about here---

It would appear that time spent in child care is largely a function of the basic constraints associated with time availability. In particular, both spouses spend the most time if there are two or more children under five. While the respondent's hours of paid work reduces time spent with child care, the amount of reduction is small, amounting to 3.8 fewer minutes per extra hour worked for women, and 1.7 fewer minutes for men.

The amount of housework done by these persons working full-time is also affected by time availability factors. In particular, an extra hour of paid work on a given day reduces men's housework by 17.1 minutes and women's by 19.5 minutes. However, the demands associated with the number and ages of children affect women's housework more so than that of men. In addition, women's housework is increased when their partners do more paid work, and it is reduced if she earns more than half of family income. Given that these two considerations do not significantly affect the amount of housework done by men, we can conclude women's time in housework is a function of considerations beyond time availability.

Discussion

Hypotheses associated with time availability would suggest that men and women should engage in family work according to demands on their time and their capacity to respond to these demands. Demands would especially be created by the number and ages of children in the home, while the capacity to respond would be measured by their own time spent away from home in paid labour. That is, the constraints of the work-family system itself would affect time-use in unpaid work. In effect, these factors consistently influence the child care performed by both mothers and fathers who are employed full-time. In addition, the unadjusted results show that both men and women do less paid work and more unpaid work when they have children under 19 living at home.

However, in other regards these results based on the 1992 time-use survey present a lack of gender symmetry. In particular, the number and ages of children influence women's time in housework, but not men's time. Women's housework is increased when their husbands do more paid work, but men did not alter their time expenditure in housework when their wives worked longer hours. In addition, women do less housework when they earn more than half of family income. This would suggest that questions of relative resources also affect women's housework, wherein they do more housework when they have less other resources. However, it would not appear that men's housework is affected by their relative contributions of resources, as measured by their income and their contribution to the total family income.

These elements of gender asymmetry in the determinants of housework point to the importance of gender itself as a key determinant. Domestic work forms part of the basis, both material and cultural, on which the social relations between men and women are realized. Berk (1985) finds that the allocation of time and tasks in household production

produces goods and services, but it also produces gender. In particular, she found that the total work to be done influences the extent and nature of wives' contributions to domestic work, but has little effect on husbands'. Feree (1990) argues that the symbolic and structural division of labour, both paid and unpaid, is one of the key ways in which families construct gender. Stated differently, gender itself has meanings associated with housework. For Hartmann (1981: 393), the creation of gender can be thought of as the creation of a division of labour between the sexes, of two categories of workers who depend on each other.

Based on data from Halifax, Shaw (1988: 336) analyzed the different meanings attributed to housework by women and men. These differences could be attributed to "the fact that household labour is closely associated with the female gender role and as such is thought of as women's work." In particular, men perceived more freedom of choice in their participation in housework activities, while women more often evaluated their own performance in these activities.

In a broader context, Brines (1994: 661) observes that "marriage provides a setting for childbearing, the division of labor, ... and a stage for the enactment of claims ... particularly those attached to the deepest sense of what one is -- one's gender identity". She observes that gender asymmetry in unpaid work may be partly understood through the cultural framing of manhood as an accomplishment, and masculinity as "not feminine", that is, not someone who does domestic work. In effect, her analysis finds that men do the least housework if they are complete providers or completely supported. Haddad (1996) finds that the men who are equal earners do the most housework, possibly because their masculinity is less dependent on avoiding domestic work.

Several authors have concluded that gender is a crucial variable based on the observation that the variation in women's and men's participation in domestic work remains largely unexplained, even by the theoretically important variables of relative resources, time availability and gender ideology. While these variables explain some of the variation, there is need for a further explanation of the remaining uniformity wherein women do more domestic work than men (Shelton, 1990; Calastanti and Bailey, 1991; Leslie et al., 1991). Especially when considering specific household tasks, role sharing is limited and spheres of domestic activity are highly segregated by sex (Blair and Lichter, 1991).

Further support for the importance of gender itself emerges from the frequent observation that models apply differently to women and men. For instance, Peterson and Gerson (1992) find that women's time at work especially reduces the time they have available for domestic work, and thus it increases the husband's relative share in domestic work. However, men's time at work does not have such an influence. The present analysis also finds important asymmetry between women and men in terms of the variables affecting domestic work. In particular, for couples where both are working full-time, men's time in housework does not respond to the number and ages of children, nor to the wife's hours of paid work. That is, women's domestic work responds to the spouse's time in paid work, but this does not occur for men.

Conversely, there are elements of time use that can be interpreted in terms of reduced gender differences. Moves toward gender equality need to take into account the way in which men and women currently spend their time, whether it be in paid or unpaid work. From his analysis of select parents who said they shared at least some aspects of parenting, Coltrane (1996) predicts an increase in future sharing because sharing is more

likely to occur in the following conditions: wives who are employed more hours and more attached to their jobs, women earning more of the total household income and especially co-providers, wives negotiating for change and relinquishing control over managing the home and children, more ideological support for gender equality, husbands employed fewer hours, fathers who are involved in the care of infants, and smaller family sizes. In addition, women who delay parenting and who are remarried are more likely to be able to negotiate a more equitable arrangement. The present study is also encouraging in the sense that time spent in child care is largely a function of time availability considerations, for both men and women. In addition, men and women reduce their domestic work (both child care and housework) when they spend more time in paid work. Finally, women who earn more than half of family income do less housework, and the 1986 study found that men who earn half of family income do more housework.

These moves toward gender equality clearly also need to take into consideration questions of the paid work world, including the extent of family-friendly policies. For instance, in Davies and Carrier's (1995) analysis based on 1982 Canadian data, it was found that men in female dominated occupations did more domestic work. It could be that men in such occupations are more feminist in their gender role attitudes. However, it could also be that female dominated occupations have established more family-friendly practices that increase the potential for family time of both female and male workers.

The relative lack of support for measures of relative resources may also point to the decreasing relevance of the underlying model based on complementary roles. In effect, questions of relative resources are based on a model where spouses specialize because this is the most efficient productive strategy. However, as Oppenheimer (1994) has

argued, this "trading model" makes more sense when one sex has limited opportunities in the paid labour market. The specialization in domestic work has always presented problems in terms of the well-being of women following marital separation. With the deteriorating relative economic status of young men, specialization presents further problems for young couples. That is, especially in its extreme form, sex-role segregation increases the vulnerability of individuals and families. The two-earner model thus becomes an adaptive strategy. In particular, it provides an insurance against the loss of the breadwinner's earning capacity and against his unwillingness to share income with a (former) spouse. Oppenheimer (1994: 333) concludes that "if the basis for marriage is specialization and exchange, then marriage seems an increasingly anachronistic social form." The alternative of a collaborative model has a stronger basis in a low fertility society where the opportunity structure involves less gender difference, and consequently where women's economic well-being is less contingent on entry into reproductive relations.

REFERENCES

- Berk, Sarah F.
1985 *The gender factory: The apportionment of work in American households*. New York: Plenum.
- Becker, Gary S.
1981 *A Treatise on the Family*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Becker, Gary S.
1965 "A Theory of the Allocation of Time." *Economic Journal* 75:494-517.
- Blair, Samson L. and Daniel T. Lichter
1991 "Measuring the Division of Household Labour: Gender Segregation Among American Couples." *Journal of Family Issues*. 12(1):91-113.
- Blood, Robert and Donald M. Wolfe
1960 *Husbands and Wives: The Dynamics of Married Living*. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.
- Brines, Julie
1994 "Economic Dependency, Gender and the Division of labor in the home." *American Journal of Sociology* 100 (3):652-688.
- Calasanti, Toni M. and Carol A. Bailey
1991 "Gender Inequality and the Division of Household Labor in the United States and Sweden: A Socialist-Feminist Approach." *Social Problems* 38:34-53.
- Coverman, Shelley
1985 "Explaining Husbands' Participation in Domestic Labor." *The Sociological Quarterly* 26:81-97.
- Davies, Loraine and Donna D. McAlpine
1995 "Paid and Unpaid Labour: Costs and Benefits for Women's and Men's Psychological Well-being." Paper presented at the *Society for the Study of Social Problems* August 1995.
- Davies, Loraine and Jane P. Carrier
1998 "The importance of Power Relations for the Division of Household Labour." *Canadian Journal of Sociology* (forthcoming).
- Delphy, Christine and D. Leonard
1992 *Familiar Exploitation: A New Analysis of Marriage in Contemporary Western Societies*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.

Douthitt, Robin A.
1989 "The Sexual Division of Labour Within the Home: Have Gender Roles Changed?" *Sex-Roles* 18:531-553.

Engels, Frederick
1975 *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. E. B. Leacock, (ed.). New York: International Publishers Inc.

Feree, Myra M.
1990 "Beyond Separate Spheres: Feminism and Family Research." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 52(3): 866-884.

Goldscheider, Francis and Linda Waite
1991 *New Families, No Families: The Transformation of the American Home*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Haddad, Anton
1996 *The Sexual Division of Household Labour: Pragmatic Strategies or Patriarchal Dynamics?: An Analysis of Two Case Studies*. North York: York University.

Hartmann, Heidi
1981 "The Family as the Locus of Gender, Class and Political Struggle: The Example of Housework." *Signs* 6(3):366-394.

Hochschild, Arlie
1989 *The second shift*. New York: Viking.

Kamo, Yoshinori
1988 "Determinants of Household Division of Labour: Resources, Power and Ideology." *Journal of Family Issues* 60:150-169.

Kempeneers, Marianne
1992 *Le travail au féminin*. Montreal: Presses de l'Universite de Montreal.

Anderson, Leslie L. E. and Meredith Branson
1991 "Responsibility for Children: The Role of Gender and Employment." *Journal of Family Issues* 12:197-210.

Nakhaie, M.R, 1995.
"Housework in Canada: The National Picture." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 24(3):409-425.

Oppenheimer, Valerie K.

1994 "Women's Rising Employment and the Future of the Family in Industrial Society."
Population and Development Review 20(2):293-335.

Parsons, Talcott and Robert F. Bales

1955 *Family, socialization and interaction process*. New York: Free Press.

Peterson, Richard R. and Kathleen Gerson

1992 "Determinants of Responsibility for child Care Arrangements Among Dual-Earner Couples." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 54:527-536.

Presser, Harriet

1994 "Employment Schedules Among Dual-Earner Spouses and the Division of Household Labour by Gender." *American Sociological Review* 59:348-364.

Shaw, Susan M.

1988 "Gender Differences in the Definition and Perception of Household Labour."
Family Relations 37:333-337.

Shelton, Beth

1990 "The Distribution of Household Tasks: Does Wife's Employment Status Make a Difference?" *Journal of Family Issues* 11:115-135.

Spain, Dephne and Suzanne Bianchi

1996 *Balancing act: Motherhood, Marriage and Employment Among American women*.
New York: Sage Foundation.

Table 1 Full-Time Employed, Married Men and Women in Dual-Earner Households, by each Variable in the Analysis

	All Men %	All Fathers %	All Women %	All Mothers %
All Variables	of total	of total	of total	of total
Control Variables				
<u>Age</u>				
Up to 24 Years	3.2	1.0	7.4	2.9
25 to 29	12.1	7.4	14.4	12.6
30 to 34	17.6	19.4	19.2	24.1
35 to 39	19	23.3	17.9	25.7
40 to 44	18.6	24.5	16.9	20.6
45 to 49	15.1	15.8	12.2	11.0
50 to 54	6.7	3.2	7.2	2.3
55 or over	7.8	5.4	4.8	0.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100	100
Valid N	758	461	838	504
<u>Respondent's Education</u>				
No High School Diploma	17.8	18.2	11.3	9.2
High School Diploma	17.3	19.1	22.3	22.5
Some College, Trade School or University	15.5	15.6	18.2	19.2
College or Trade School Diploma	24.9	25.0	28.0	28.5
Bachelor Degree	15.6	14.8	15.4	15.8
Professional or Graduate Degree	6.9	5.9	4.0	3.8
Other	2.0	1.8	0.9	1.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Valid N	756	459	833	502
<u>Respondent's Relative Income</u>				
Earns Less Than Half of Family Income	5.3	4.5	27.5	29.2
Earns Half of Family Income	13.6	13.9	27.1	28.0
Earns More Than Half of Family Income	68.4	71.3	25.7	25.5
Missing Personal, hhld or Both Incomes	12.7	10.2	19.7	17.3
Total	100.0	100	100.0	100.0
Valid N	758	461	838	504
<u>Respondent's Personal Income</u>				
Below \$10,000	1.1	1.0	7.8	7.6
\$10,000 to \$14,999	1.2	1.2	11.0	10.6
\$15,000 to \$19,999	5.3	3.5	14.5	16.4
\$20,000 to \$29,999	17.7	17.3	24.1	24.0
\$30,000 to \$39,999	23.4	26.1	15.3	13.5
\$40,000 to \$49,999	18.5	19.2	8.0	9.7
\$50,000 to \$59,999	13.2	15.2	3.2	3.9
\$60,000 or Over	9.4	8.4	2.6	1.9
Did Not Know or Was Not Stated	10.1	8.1	13.6	12.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Valid N	758	461	838	504

Table 1 Continued.

	All Men %	All Fathers %	All Women %	All Mothers %
ALL VARIABLES	of all	of all	of all	of all
TIME AVAILABILITY VARIABLES				
<u>Number and Ages of Children</u>				
No children under 19	39.2	0.0	39.8	0.0
One child under 5	7.8	12.8	7.0	11.6
Two or more children under 5	12.5	20.6	12.0	20.0
One over 5 and under 12	5.2	8.6	5.2	8.7
Two over 5 and under 12	8.3	13.7	9.2	15.3
One over 12	5.9	9.7	4.7	7.8
Two or more over 12	11.2	18.4	11.9	19.7
Other Combinations of Children	9.9	16.2	10.1	16.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Valid N	758	461	838	504
<u>Partner's Hours in Paid Employment</u>				
Worked between 30 and 35 hours a week	22.4	22.6	7.2	6.3
Worked between 35.5 and 40 hours a week	59.5	59.6	51.7	52.7
Worked between 40.5 and 45 hours a week	6.0	6.0	10.0	9.6
Worked between 45.5 and 50 hours a week	7.0	7.7	11.0	11.4
Worked between 50.5 and 55 hours a week	1.5	1.4	4.1	3.6
Worked 55.5 or more hours a week	3.5	2.8	15.9	16.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Valid N	758	461	838	504
<u>Respondent's Hours in Paid Work</u>				
Did not work on given day	27.8	27.9	29.2	33.2
Under two hours a day	1.8	2.4	3.3	3.3
Between two and four hours a day	2.7	3.1	2.4	2.0
Between four and six hours a day	3.5	5.0	4.6	5.1
Between six and eight hours a day	6.2	5.5	16.9	18.0
Between eight and ten hours a day	34.6	36.0	31.1	29.3
More than ten hours a day	23.4	20.0	12.5	9.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Valid N	758	461	838	504
TOTAL WORK DAY	mean time spent (hrs/day)	mean time spent (hrs/day)	mean time spent (hrs/day)	mean time spent (hrs/day)
Housework	2.08	2.14	3.00	3.32
Child Care	0.41	0.70	0.73	1.22
Total Domestic Work	2.49	2.84	3.73	4.52
Paid Work	6.64	6.4	5.77	5.26
Total Productive Work	9.13	9.2	9.50	9.78
Valid (N)	758	461	838	504

Source: General Social Survey, Cycle 7 (Statistics Canada, 1992).

Table 2. Unstandardized Regression Coefficients of Time Spent in Housework By Employed

Dual-Earner, Married Men and Women				
	Employed Men		Employed Women	
<u>TIME AVAILABILITY VARIABLES</u>	b	S.E. [†]	b	S.E. [†]
Number and Ages of Children				
One Child Under 5	-39.3*	19.1	21.2	19.3
Two or More Children Under 5	-1.5	15.2	22.8	15.3
One Over 5 and Under 12	-0.3	22.6	33.0	21.1
Two Over 5 and Under 12	11.4	18.0	24.7	16.9
One Over 12	26.5	21.9	53.7*	23.5
Two or More Over 12	24.2	16.4	45.0**	15.6
Other Combinations of Children	-25.3	17.3	66.3***	16.3
Partner's Hours in Paid Work Per Day	-1.4	4.8	10.8***	2.8
Respondent's Hours in Paid Work Per Day	-17.1***	1.0	-19.5***	1.1
<u>RELATIVE RESOURCES</u>				
Respondent's Relative Income				
Earns Less Than Half of Family Income	-4.5	24.6	-10.2	13.1
Earns More Than Half of Family Income	-2.5	15.1	-30.0*	15.1
Missing Personal, Household, or Both Incomes	-34.8	30.6	24.0	19.9
Personal Income				
Less Than \$30,000	-23.4	13.9	4.3	14.5
\$40,000 Or More	11.56	13.1	-2.0	20.1
<u>CONTROL VARIABLES</u>				
Respondent's Age	-0.7	0.6	1.3*	0.5
Respondents' Years of Education	-1.9	1.5	1.8	1.8
F Statistic	21.5***	--	25.8***	
Constant	306.7	43.6	148.8	42.1
Adjusted R Square	0.33	--	0.35	
Number of Valid Cases	681	681	724	724

*P£.05 **P£.01 ***P£.001

[†] Standard Error

Note:

The following categories of dummy variables were excluded:
 No children Under 19 (for number and ages of children);
 Respondent Earns Half of Family Income (for relative income);

Respondent earns \$30,000 to \$39,999 (for personal income).

Source: General Social Survey, Cycle 7 (Statistics Canada, 1992).

Table 3. Unstandardized Regression Coefficients of Time Spent in Child Care By Employed Dual-Earner, Married Fathers and Mothers

<u>TIME AVAILABILITY VARIABLES</u>	Employed Men		Employed Women	
	b	S.E. [†]	b	S.E. [†]
Number and Ages of Children				
One Child Under 5	-18.7	10.4	11.3	14.1
One Over 5 and Under 12	-63.2***	12.1	-71.9***	15.9
Two Over 5 and Under 12	-28.7**	10.2	-52.5***	13.1
One Over 12	-77.4***	13.5	-131.1***	19.6
Two or More Over 12	-85.2***	10.5	-114.7***	15.5
Other Combinations of Children	-65.1***	10.2	-89.7***	14.3
Partner's Hours in Paid Work Per Day	1.1	2.9	2.8	2.3
Respondent's Hours in Paid Work Per Day	-1.7**	0.6	-3.8***	0.9
<u>RELATIVE RESOURCES</u>				
Respondent's Relative Income				
Earns Less Than Half of Family Income	-21.6	16.1	20.5	10.8
Earns More Than Half of Family Income	0.8	9.3	10.7	13.2
Missing Personal, Household, or Both Incomes	-1.7	20.3	32.1	18.6
Personal Income				
Less Than \$30,000	8.5	8.5	-20.1	12.8
\$40,000 Or More	-2.0	7.9	-9.1	17.4
<u>CONTROL VARIABLES</u>				
Respondent's Age	-.02	0.5	0.3	0.8
Respondents' Years of Education	2.3*	0.9	1.1	1.6
F Statistic	10.3***	--	13.3***	--
Constant	60.4	29.1	113.8	39.8
Adjusted R Square	0.25	--	0.29	--
Number of Valid Cases	424	424	442	442

*P£.05 **P£.01 ***P£.001

[†] Standard Error

Note:

The following categories of dummy variables were excluded:
 No children Under 19 (for number and ages of children);
 Respondent Earns Half of Family Income (for relative income);
 Respondent earns \$30,000 to \$39,999 (for personal income).

Source: General Social Survey, Cycle 7 (Statistics Canada, 1992).